(Case called)

2.3

THE COURT: Good morning to each of you. The reason I asked for this conference call is I know that this case had originally been assigned to Judge Torres, who referred it to Magistrate Judge Ellis, and discovery has been proceeding under Judge Ellis's discovery schedule and case management plan.

I typically don't refer to magistrate judge's discovery; I like to keep it myself. As I looked at Judge Ellis's schedule, it seemed to me this is a long schedule. I don't really know exactly what is going on, and I'm deciding whether I want to withdraw the referral and take it myself or whether things have already progressed to the point where that is not worth doing. That is the purpose of this call.

I have great respect and admiration for Judge Ellis.

It is nothing personal. I just like to do my own discovery.

Where are we at with Judge Ellis? Is he involved in this process with you?

MR. BEHAR: Your Honor, we appeared in front of Judge Ellis for an initial scheduling conference, introduced ourselves and the case. Once our scheduling order was entered, we have been able to proceed with discovery without any issues that we haven't been able to resolve among ourselves. So we have not had to enlist the court for anything. We have not appeared in front of Judge Ellis since that initial scheduling conference.

THE COURT: That helps. Thank you. His scheduling order doesn't use hard dates. It is dates triggered or pegged off of the date of his order. I generally give hard dates so everybody knows what is happening and when it is happening without having to do math.

MR. BEHAR: Your Honor, we have created an annotated version of that that Mr. Hotz and his team created. We have provided that to Judge Ellis, and we can send that to chambers, perhaps should have done that already.

THE COURT: Tell me, when does fact discovery end according to your annotated version?

MR. HOTZ: March 15, 2018, I believe, your Honor.

Tom, is that your understanding?

MR. BEHAR: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

THE COURT: March 15, 2018. That seems like a long way away. You're optimistic. We might not even be alive by then. There may be a giant meteor that takes us out.

MR. HOTZ: I'm confident we will by alive by them.

THE COURT: The Mayan calendar might suggest otherwise, Mr. Hotz.

MR. HOTZ: Your Honor, if I may be heard briefly on this?

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. HOTZ: I would like to explain why from our perspective I think the current schedule is more than

2.3

reasonable to tell you what is proceeding apace. As your Honor is well aware, the amended complaint contains new allegations and new customers, and we are moving full steam ahead through the discovery process right now.

We have a vendor engaged. We have 7 million pages of discovery. We received another bunch of discovery, which is smaller, to be clear, but by my count included approximately 70 FBI 302s. We also received supplemental disclosures from the SEC. We expect to be filing our own supplemental disclosures.

At least from what I have seen, your Honor, I think there are a number of issues that make this case unique that require discovery. I envision there will be substantial discovery from third parties.

As Mr. Bednar and I indicated in the letter he submitted to the Court, I think there will be a substantial amount of third-party discovery from what I will call colloquially the customers, the entities that engaged Convergex, many of whom, as we indicated in our letter, would require letters rogatory and a process around that. Mr. Bednar and I have set up proposed dates in the proposed letter to meet and confer around and to set up a schedule to do that. That will take considerable time.

In addition, your Honor, we have again an issue which is critically important for our defense, which is the issue of the prices the clients received and the execution they

2.3

received. I have set up a meeting with Mr. Bednar for March 3rd to go to the SEC's office and review the GPRO system, which as I understand it would contain the trade information from the Bermuda affiliate that would reflect the taking of the TP or spread that is at issue here.

I don't want to prejudge that, but from what I understand, this is a very complicated system. I have requested a copy from the SEC. Mr. Bednar doesn't have another copy. I expect one of the things I will be requesting from Convergex is that data. Without previewing it or prejudging it, I think that is a very complicated and massive amount of data that has to be reviewed and analyzed. I think that is also going to require experts, as I indicated.

Lastly, your Honor, as I also indicated, there is likely to be significant expert testimony both on this data that I just mentioned but also on the transitions in the market generally, as well as materiality, and also, as I mentioned in the argument on motion to dismiss, disgorgement.

There is quite a lot to be done, your Honor. We are moving expeditiously and doing all we can reasonably do to get this done as quickly as possible. As Mr. Bednar indicates, have had an ability to work through our differences and have had no need to enlist Judge Ellis.

THE COURT: Do you have an opinion as to whether I should withdraw the referral and take this over myself? That's

2.3

a tough question to ask a lawyer. Maybe I shouldn't ask that.

Do you have any objection to it?

MR. HOTZ: Your Honor, I have no objection to your withdrawing the referral and overseeing the discovery process yourself. I would be more than happy to have your Honor preside over whatever discovery issues we have.

THE COURT: Tell me about expert discovery. I'll come back to the SEC in a minute. Expert discovery will consist of what?

MR. HOTZ: Your Honor, it is difficult for me to be more precise than I was, but I envision an expert that is going to have to go through and analyze the GPRO data because I think an issue that is squarely at issue in the case is the amount of spread, the spread that was taken. We are going to need to have an expert go through that data and analyze that.

I also envision an expert more broadly on the question of transition management, what transition management is and the types of considerations that go into a customer's decision to pick a specific transition manager. Also on that score, relatedly, I think there would be expert testimony similar to that in the <a href="Litvak">Litvak</a> case, which no doubt your Honor is familiar with, on the issue of materiality here.

Lastly, as I think your Honor described it in an oral argument on the motion to dismiss, an expert which would effectively be on the issue, assuming the worst, of

H2taseq.16-cv-02733-RJS Document 59 Filed 03/17/17 Page 7 of 10

2.3

disgorgement. You called it I think a damages expert, but I view it as a disgorgement expert.

Those would be in broad strokes the areas for expert testimony.

THE COURT: Let me ask the folks at the SEC if they have a view or an objection to my taking over the discovery stage of this and if they have thoughts about expert discovery and the timetable here.

MR. BEHAR: Your Honor, no objection to the Court taking over management of discovery. As to the overall schedule, given the number of likely depositions and the fact that some of those will be overseas and might involve use of letters rogatory, we think the overall schedule is reasonable.

I had hoped to get through the litigation with far fewer types of experts than what Mr. Hotz is indicating he will pursue. That may cause me to go back to the drawing board to make sure that we have enough expertise. I think the SEC is likely to have one or two experts on general broker-dealer operations and considerations in the transition management industry. I don't think we are going to cover as much of the waterfront as the defense, but we will have at least one expert.

THE COURT: The plan is March 2018 for fact discovery when? June or July for expert discovery?

MR. HOTZ: June 15th, 2018, your Honor, according to

H2 tase 9:16-cv-02733-RJS Document 59 Filed 03/17/17 Page 8 of 10

1 the annotated version of the order, we have to June 15, 2018. 2

That is in paragraph 7(a), I believe.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BEHAR: Right. Your Honor, we have that envisioned as 30 days after the end of fact discovery all expert reports are due at the same time, 30 days after for all rebuttal reports, and within 30 days of that we would finish depositions of those experts. I still think that that is realistic.

THE COURT: Did Judge Ellis schedule a post-discovery conference date or anything like that?

MR. BEHAR: Not with the Court, but a meet-and-confer between the parties 30 days before the close of fact discovery.

THE COURT: What I am going to ask you folks to do is send me the document that you have been referring to. Also take a look at my template case management plan and scheduling order and see if you think that you can plug in your annotated arrangement into mine. If you think you can't, just tell me that. But if you think that you can and if you have to add things, add things; I don't mind that.

I'm contemplating doing a different case management plan that more or less tracks my standard order tweaked as needed, because this is not a typical case by any means. Then also what you have been referring to today so I can get a better handle on the discovery. That is I think the direction I'm headed in.

2.3

I'm probably going to amend the referral, have the referral to Judge Ellis go forward only with respect to settlement, which is what I typically do with magistrate judges in my cases. Have you thought about when you would be in a position to talk about settlement?

MR. HOTZ: Your Honor, in the letter we jointly sent you, Mr. Bednar and I envisioned that we would have discussions and meet and confer on the issue of settlement on April 19th and on June 30th. I think April 19th would be premature to involve the magistrate, at least from my perspective. But it may well make sense on June 30th to involve Magistrate Judge Ellis, from my perspective, just given the volume of discovery here.

THE COURT: Mr. Bednar?

MR. BEHAR: That sounds reasonable.

THE COURT: Let's do that. If you can within a week get me a copy of what you have been referring to and maybe a crack at trying to plug into my standard template the agreements that you have got in place, that will allow me to know whether it makes sense to do this. I'm inclined to amend the referral.

MR. BEHAR: Yes, your Honor.

MR. HOTZ: Yes.

THE COURT: That's what I wanted to chat about. Is there anything else that was on anybody's mind?